DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 301 CS 205 770

AUTHOR Kochevar, John J.
TITLE Needs Satisfied by Media Use: An Audience Typology.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 39p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (63rd, Boston, MA, August 9-13, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Behavioral Science Research; *Information Needs; Information Sources; Journalism; *Media Research; *Need Gratification; *News Media; Newspapers; News Reporting; *Public Opinion; *Use Studies

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to segment the mass media audience on the basis of basic needs and media satisfactions. Two hundred undergraduate journalism students completed lengthy questionnaires rating their media use before and during the New York newspaper strike of 1978, along with their basic needs, media satisfactions, and a variety of other measures related to media use. Basic needs were categorized into needs for information/interpretation, social comparison, consumer information, escape, relaxation, and social contact/integration. Respondents were grouped, based on basic need scores, into four audience types: (1) the information dependent emphasized their needs for information about the environment and about other people; (2) escapists needed to escape, relax, and have something to do with others; (3) the socially conscious had a high need for information about other people; and (4) the self concerned had high needs for media use and consumer information and a high interest in advertising and immediate gratification. These four types differed significantly on media use, content preferences, media satisfactions, and demographic indicators. The evidence for such different audience types has important conceptual and methodological implications for mass communication research. (AEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192301

Presented to:
Theory and Methodology Division
Association for Education in Journalism Convention
Boston University, August, 1980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NEEDS SATISFIED BY MEDIA USE: AN AUDIENCE TYPOLOGY

John J. Kochevar

Department of Journalism and Mass Communication
1021 Main Building
New York University
Washington Square
New York, New York 10003

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Kochevar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS205770

John J. Kochevar is an assistant professor of Journalism and Mass Communication at New York University. This study was supported, in part, by a grant from the New York University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The New York Times provided key punching services and part of the data analysis. The author would like to thank Kenneth Warwick of Cohen-Warwick Associates for the use of his cluster analysis program and Nadyne Edison of New York University for her assistance with the coding and content analysis of the open-ended questions.

NEEDS SATISFIED BY MEDIA USE: AN AUDIENCE TYPOLOGY

On Tuesday morning, August 9th, 1978, 1550 pressmen struck New York's three major daily newspapers. They were soon joined by four other unions and more than three million readers of the New York Times, Post and Daily News were effectively deprived of their regular daily newspapers. The strike lasted 57 days but, aside from some initial inconvenience, it had little effect on the city. Movies and theatre attendance remained stable, retail sales rose and the economy as a whole was unimpaired (McFadden, 1978). To a certain extent this lack of effect was probably due to the extraordinary richness of the New York media environment. Most of New York's 13 television stations and more than 70 radio stations responded to the strike with special programs (and increased advertising rates) and three interim daily newspapers quickly appeared on the streets. Readers seeking alternative media were seldom inconvenienced.

The sudden removal of a major mass medium from society offers a unique opportunity for media researchers. During an earlier New York newspaper strike, for example, Berelson (1949) asked readers in depth interviews why they missed the newspapers. He found they did not particularly miss the news of specific events. Rather, the newspaper was used for general information about and interpretation of public affairs, as a tool for daily living, for respite, for social prestige and as a substitute for social contact. Together with two "non-conscious" reasons - the desirability of reading and habit - these motives offered a simple explanation of why people read newspapers. During the long strike of 1962-63, Kimball (1963) studied the reactions of a panel of readers and discovered complex changes in media exposure related to habits, content preferences and demographic characteristics. The strike of 1978 provided an opportunity to build on this research with the relatively more sophisticated conceptual and methodological tools developed in the last twenty years.

Today, the most active conceptual orientation in mass communication is the uses and gratifications approach. Like Berelson (1947) and Kimball (1963), gratification researchers are concerned with why and how audiences use the media. In contrast to the earlier, somewhat intuitive research however, the uses and gratifications approach has been worked out in greater conceptual detail. Although the approach has no single, comprehensive theoretical formulation, there are consistent notions underlying the work of most investigators. According to Rosengren's (1974) outline of the paradigm, for example, people are assumed to have basic needs that interact with other social, psychological and situational influences and lead to media use. The gratifications derived from such use, again interacting with a variety of factors, lead to habitual patterns of gratification seeking and media exposure. These patterns, in turn, are hypothesized to mediate the effects resulting from exposure to media content. So far most research has focused on descriptions of gratifications sought from the media. Less well represented are studies of the origins of needs or their role in media effects. In all, the research area is an active one, raising more questions than it answers.

The general objective of this study was to assess the predictive utility of the uses and gratifications approach in the context of the New York newspaper strike. Because of the unique situation it was possible to examine the effects and interactions of a number of variables suggested to play a role in media use. The study was designed to answer the following questions:

> 1. Can audience needs and satisfactions explain changes in media exposure patterns? Both Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) and Brown, Crammond and Wilde (1974) were concerned with functional interchangeability of media but in neither study did investigators have a situation where a medium was actually withdrawn. If the uses and gratifications approach has any conceptual or practical utility it should be able to predict how people compensate for the loss of their regular newspapers.

2. Will events make a difference in habitual exposure patterns? During the strike there was a major summit meeting at Camp David, two Popes died and the New York Yankees were involved in a pennant race. Were these and other events sufficiently compelling to again modify behavior already changed due to the absence of newspapers? Although Rosengren (1974) alludes to the importance of "society" and Peled and Katz (1974) analyzed audience needs and gratification during the Yom Kippur War there has been no attempt to explore how habitual needs and gratifications interact with changing events.

3. How does the degree of audience "activity" interact with gratifications sought and media use? Blumler (1979) has addressed the importance of activity as a major assumption of the uses and gratifications approach and Levy (1978) discriminated between active and passive users of television news but no one has attempted to see how degree of audience activity relates to gratifications derived from exposure. If activity intervenes between needs, gratifications and further media exposure then one would expect people who actively used newspapers before the strike to actively substitute other media or become more active in their use of other media.

4. To what extent does the social context of the audience produce variations in responses to the absence of newspapers? McQuail, Blumler and Brown (1972), Blumler (1979) and Kline, Miller and Morrison (1974) have all demonstrated that social circumstances, background, and experiences of audiences were related to gratifications and media effects. Thus, there is reason to expect that what people talk about and how much they know compared to others might mediate the relationship between audience needs and reactions to the strike.

5. To what extent can people be characterized by their needs and the satisfactions they derive from the media? McQuail, Blumler and Brown (1972) list this as one of the main questions to be answered by the Leeds group but, as yet, none of their published studies has concerned this topic. The one attempt to group people according to the gratifications sought from the media appears to be Gutman's (1978) Q-analysis of 26 Californian television viewers. His results suggested that it is possible to segment an audience into similar types. Unfortunately, there was no attempt to assess the discriminant validity of the groups. Thus, it remains to be seen if viewer types are enduring syndromes of behavior or simply artifacts of the Q-technique.

Each of these questions is complicated enough to require a study of its own. For methodological reasons, however, it is important to determine if audience types exist before attempting to answer the other questions. Specifically, if evidence for the existence of types is found then the focus of the analysis

will shift from individual needs or gratifications to syndromes of needs or gratifications. In effect, the unit of analysis will shift from individual respondents to groups of respondents who are similar in their basic needs. Ignoring the possibility of audience types could obscure important relationships. Audience members, for example, might have the same "need for information" but differ radically on other needs. An analysis that focused on the relationship between a single need and other behavior would overlook possible differences caused by the total syndrome of needs.

The question of audience types could also have important conceptual ramifications. Many investigators have touted the uses and gratifications approach as an improvement over the traditional campaign studies of mass communication because it focuses on the audience. Since it has been demonstrated that audiences seek different gratifications from the media a logical next step would be to look more closely at the nature of that audience. Instead of speaking of the reactions of a whole audience, the focus would change to the reactions of different types of people in that audience. Instead of examining the psychological correlates of needs, researchers could study the psychological differences between audience types. Audience typologies based on needs or gratifications would thus allow further conceptual elaboration of the paradigm.

The question of whether needs and gratifications influenced exposure patterns during the New York newspaper strike and the subsidiary questions about intervening variables must wait until the more fundamental question about audience types is answered. The purpose of this first report, then, will be to describe the evidence for regarding a mass media audience as a conglomerate of separate types of people differing in their basic needs and media satisfactions.

DESIGN

Earlier strike studies relied on very simple analytical techniques to ferret out changes in media use. More recently, advances in statistical methods and high speed computers have allowed researchers to introduce designs and analyses of some complexity . The uses and gratifications literature abounds with factor analysis as well as less common data analytic techniques such as smallest space analysis (Katz, Gurevitch and Haas, 1973), linkage analysis (McQuail, Blumler and Brown, 1972; Levy, 1978), and multidimensional scaling (Lometti, Reeves and Bybee, 1977). In this study most variables were operationalized with multiple indicators, creating a long and complex questionnaire. Factor analysis was used to reduce the data to manageable proportions and a cluster analytic technique was used to group respondents into typologies. This approach to typology development has not been used previously in communication research and is thus described in some detail.

The Questionnaire

One of the problems with uses and gratification research has been the limited number of items uses to tap gratifications. Many researchers have used telephone interviews to reach more representative samples but have had to sacrifice the depth and reliability achieveable with larger batteries of questions. To overcome this problem a detailed self-administered questionnaire was used in this study. Respondents were 200 undergraduate students enrolled in three journalism classes at New York University. About half the students were journalism majors while the others were from the business school, social science departments and the humanities. They ranged in age from 16 to 46 and were equally divided among freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors. About 60 percent were female. Obviously, generalizability was sacrificed for depth.

Furthermore, the attempt to isolate significantly different audience types in such a homogenous group did not appear promising. On the other hand, if distinct types did emerge the possibility for identifying such groups in more heterogeneous audiences should be more likely.

The questionnaire was quite demanding, requiring an average of one hour and 10 minutes to complete. Respondents were cautioned not to over or underestimate their use of any particular medium because they felt one was more socially desirable than another. They were allowed to complete the questionnaire at home and were given class credit for their participation. About 95 percent of the returns were usable. All were coded and error checked by hand before key punching and further error checks were performed with the computer.

The questionnaire, containing a total of 658 individual items, was divided into the following six sections:

1. Media Use. These questions measured exposure patterns before and during the strike for the following six media: movies, radio, books, magazines, television and newspapers. In addition to measures of daily and weekly exposure there were items tapping content preferences and how actively respondents used radio, television and newspapers.

2. Open Ended Questions. Six items asked for detailed responses about reactions to the strike and media substitution behavior.

3. Reactions to News Events. Respondents were asked to rate their interest in eight news events occuring during the strike, media use for each event, satisfactions and dissatisfactions with media coverage, and how much they missed their newspapers.

4. Social Context. Items measured knowledge compared to friends, communication activity and opinion leadership on various topics.

5. Needs and Satisfactions. Following Katz, Gurevitch and Haas, (1973) respondents were first asked to rate how important each of 35 needs were in their lives on a five point scale ranging from "extremely important" to "not at all important". After rating all the needs they were asked to rate how well each of the six media satisfied each individual need on a five point scale ranging from "very well" to "not well at all".

6. Demographics. Respondents indicated age, sex, race and other characteristics on a number of common demographic variables.

Methodology

The overall purpose of this analysis was to group respondents into types on the basis of their needs. Many communication researchers are familiar with Q-type factor analytic procedures that group people rather than items. The approach used here, however, did not use a conventional Q-technique for clustering and,overall, was more similar to what market researchers (cf. Engel et al., 1972) call the "segmentation" approach. This approach is popular in commercial research and has been applied to magazine readers (Bass, et al., 1969) and more recently to newspaper readers (Larkin and Cerotta, 1979). It is possible to segment, or "type" audiences according to many different criteria. Larkin and Grotta, for example, divided readers on the basis of age but market researchers (cf. Haley, 1968, 1971) have segmented consumers according to lifestyles, psychological characteristics and benefits sought from products.

In general, the cluster analytic techniques used in segmentation sort people so that each cluster is similar on some criterion measure but different in the in the aggregate from other groups. A full discussion of cluster analytic techniques is beyond the scope of this paper and interested readers are directed to reviews by Bailey (1974) and Sokol (1977). It will be useful, however, to summarize the stages of the analysis before reporting detailed results.

The analysis proceeded in the following stages:

1. Factor analysis. Need importance ratings were factor analyzed and reduced to manageable indices. Each respondent received a set of factor scores.

2. Cluster Analysis. Respondents were grouped into types on the basis of their factor scores. The Singleton-Kautz cluster analysis technique[1] yielded five solutions, where each solution represented a different set of respondent clusters.

3. Cluster Validation. The problem at this stage was to choose the "best" solution on the basis of empirical and conceptual criteria. Each solution was run against a set of variables hypothesized to relate to needs. The solution showing the largest number of significantly different scores between clusters was then run against other variables to further elaborate the characteristics of the basic groups.

This analysis will yield an empirical "best" fit to a set of variables hypothesized to differentiate between types. Unfortunately, there are no appropriate statistical tests for the reliability of such cluster solutions (Green and Tull, 1970). If the types show additional differences on variables not included in the initial analysis, one can have greater confidence that the differences between types are meaningful. Like factor analysis, the generalizability of any particular cluster solution depends on the items and respondents. Although cluster analysis could conceivably be used to test prior conceptualizations, it was used here as a heuristic technique for uncovering patterns and associations within a body of data.

RESULTS

The Factor Analysis

Factor analysis of needs or gratifications are well represented in the uses and gratifications literature. As several investigators (Lometti, Reeves and Bybee, 1977; Becker, 1979) have commented, however, prior research has not produced noticeably consistent results. This should not be totally unexpected. Some workers have focused on needs and others on gratifications. Some have asked respondents to rate specific media content while others look for generalizations across all content. Respondents have varied, as have data collection techniques. Most importantly, no one set of needs or gratification items has gained general acceptance.

This research followed the lead of Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) by having respondents rate the importance of needs. Here, needs are assumed to be the basic motives causing media use. Use, in turn, leads to satisfaction (or "gratification") of a particular need. Most other researchers have focused directly on gratifications sought from the media in general, or from specific media content such as television news (Levy, 1978) or quiz shows (Blumler and McQuail, 1972). Needs were chosen as the basic variables in this study because there is much less doubt about their place in the causal path. As Miller and Palmgrem (1979) contend, media use leads to gratifications and gratifications in turn lead to media use: the path could easily be recursive. In contrast, it would be more difficult to say that media use or gratifications cause basic needs. Research on family communication or media use by children may someday find evidence for this proposition but the chances are the causal paths will be rather complicated. For these reasons it seemed conceptually more justifiable to build an audience typology on basic needs rather than on gratifications sought from the media.

The problem with needs is that they can be deduced from the whole panopy of human behavior. McQuire (1973), for example, derives no less than 14 sets of basic needs from different psychological theories. Gratifications, on the other hand, have been derived from a more limited set of propositions or from depth or focus group interviews (Levy, 1978) with audience members. A middle ground was chosen in this study. Some of the basic needs postulated by Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) were adopted and others were deduced from Wright's (1959) functional approach and the gratification inventory developed by Levy (1978). In each case an attempt was made to include needs that could reasonably be expected to be satisfied by media exposure. While the resulting set of items lack the consistency of theoretically derived inventories, they are at least compatible with the work of earlier investigators.

Five categories of needs were initially postulated: 1) Need for information about the environment, 2) needs for interpretation and guidance, 3) needs for diversion, 4) needs for social contact and integration, 5) needs for consumer information.

1. Needs for information about the environment. This category is suggested by Wright's (1959) "surveillance" function and has appeared in most uses and gratifications studies. It represents a general need to be aware of what is going on.

2. Needs for interpretation and guidance. This category reflects Wright's (1959) "correlation" function. In recent years it has figured prominantly in studies of the use of political news (Becker, 1979). Here, it suggests a need for information that creates a context or otherwise helps individuals judge or make decisions about people or events that could effect their lives.

3. Need for diversion. This is Wright's (1959) "entertainment" function. It has also appeared in most studies of uses and gratifications. In general, it reflects a need for relaxation, escape or entertainment.

4. Needs for social contact and integration. Wright's (1959) functional analysis included a cultural transmission or socialization function. In this case, the need for social contact and integration in society may serve this function but it is not a direct manifestation: It is hard to say that people have a "need for socialization". Rather, this category represents what McQuail,Blumler and Brown (1972) have

called "personal relationships" and what Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) designated as needs designed to strengthen contact with others. It reflects the social utility of the media as something to do with others as well as the opportunity to see how other people live.

5. Needs for consumer information. This factor is not well represented in the literature. To a certain extent it is subsumed under Wright's (1959) "correlation" function and Berelson's (1949) category "Tool for daily living". In a study of gratifications derived from newspapers, Becker (1979) found that readers gave a rather low rating to "for information in advertisements" but that the item emerged as a separate factor in factor analysis of all gratifications items. Despite the minimal attention given to consumer needs, however, there is ample evidence that people do use particular media to help guide their shopping. A quick look at most media will reveal that substantial content is directed at helping people to consume. Furthermore, focus group discussions conducted by commercial researchers often reveal that such consumer needs are basic reasons for using magazines and newspapers.

The items representing these five hypothesized dimensions are listed in Table 1.

Table 1 about here

Responses to the 35 items were first intercorrelated. Three items, "to decide who to vote for", "to pass time" and "to have something to do when alone", were eliminated from further analyses because their intercorrelations with other items were negligible. The resulting correlation matrix was factor analysed using principle factoring with iterations set at 25. Both an orthogonal-verimax rotation and an oblique rotation with delta set at zero were allowed run to final solution with all factors having an eigen value greater than 1.0.

Both rotation methods produced seven factor solutions. Inspection of the graphical presentation provided with the output from the oblique run, revealed intercorrelation between certain factors. For this reason the oblique rotation was chosen as the most empirically realistic of the solutions. Because the seventh factor had only one high loading variable the data was reanalyzed with the number of factors set at six. The final pattern matrix, shown in Table 2, was virtually identical to the original seven factor solution except for the deletion of the trivial factor.

Table 2 about here

The factors can be summarized as follows:

Factor I: Information/Interpretation.

Contrary to expectations, needs for information and interpretation merged in a single dimension. Some of the interpretation and guidance items such as "to know how to act in social situations" did not load on this dimension, but overall the factor seems to reflect both needs. The items are all cognitive motives and express a desire to develop and maintain an understanding fo the environment. In this sense, they are consistant with the notions of attribution theory as outlined by McGuire (1973).

Factor II: Social Comparison.

This factor draws items from dimensions originally representing interpretation and social contact. Four of the items suggest a direct concern with other people and the fifth - "to gain new ideas and skills" indicates that comparison might be motivated by a desire for personal growth.

Factor III: Consumer Information.

This dimension emerged as predicted. All items suggest an underlying need for information that will aid in consumption activities. The inclusion of the item "to keep up with famous people" suggest that famous people may serve as models for consumption behavior rather than as models for personal growth.

Factor IV: Escape.

The hypothesized diversion dimension did not emerge, but instead separated into two factors. This particular factor represents a straight forward attempt to escape from daily concerns and reduce tensions.

Factor V: Relaxation.

Only two items have high positive loadings on this factor and both suggest an active approach to tension reduction. A third item "to understand some of the problems other people have" has a substantial negative loading, indicating that avoidance of problems may be involved in this need.

Factor VI: Social Needs.

This dimension appears to contain items from the hypothesized need for social contact and integration. It does not seem to to reflect the need for vicarious social contact but is more utilitarian. All items reflect a broad category of need for social experiences.

As Table 3 indicates, these factors are somewhat intercorrelated. Information/interpretation is correlated with social comparison indicating, perhaps, a cognitive dimension to the social comparison need. Social

Table 3 about here

comparison is also related to the social need factor. This could result from the social context of both or it could occur because "to gain new ideas or skills" is related to the utilitarian aspect of social needs. Consumer information is also moderately associated with social needs, again, possibly because of the underlying utilitarian dimension. The escape factor is, not unexpectedly, associated with relaxation and shows the largest intercorrelation of all with social needs. It is not altogether clear why this should be although one could hypothesize that the need to do something with friends and family might be satisfied by the same kinds of situations or gratifications that satisfy escapist needs.

How does this analysis compare to others? Unfortunately, Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) used smallest space analysis to reduce their set of needs and their results can not be directly compared. Factor analyses of gratification items are also somewhat difficult to compare, but for different reasons. Very generally speaking, the mix of surveillance and correlation items contrasts with other studies except for Levy's (1978). Similarly, the split between escape and relaxation, and the rather general social need category has not appeared in other research. As mentioned earlier, there are many factors that could account for such lack of consistency.

The Cluster Analysis

The input to the cluster program used in this study consisted of standardized

factor scores from the six factor solution. The program was set to yield five solutions ranging from two clusters up to six clusters. Inspection of the results revealed types the first three solutions that were readily identifiable on the basis of their importance scores. The last two solutions, consisting of five and six groups respectively, had some very small groups and were too complicated to interpret. The choice, then, was between the two, three and four cluster solutions. The two cluster solution essentially differentiated between those who rated the information/interpretation needs as highly important and those who rated escape and relaxation more highly. The three cluster solution broke out another group that was high on social comparison needs compared to the others. The four cluster solution maintained the three earlier groups and added a fourth group with somewhat higher ratings on consumer information and low ratings on the social factors.

A "best" solution was chosen on the basis of its association with other criterion measures. Each solution was subjected to a multiple discriminant analysis with media use and media satisfaction variables as the predictors. This technique, although usually used for other purposes, is a relatively efficient way to determine how many predictors significantly discriminate between groups. In this case, the four cluster solution showed the largest number of significant differences between groups on the criterion measures.

The average importance ratings for the whole sample and for each cluster are shown in Table 4. Overall, Information/Interpretation needs were most

Table 4 about here

important. Social comparison and relaxation were tied for second place, escapist needs were fourth, social needs were fifth and needs for consumer information were least important. The four types of people can be characterized by their needs.

Type 1: Information dependent. People in this group rated their information and interpretation needs significantly higher than any of the other three groups and they were also lowest on relaxation. Their other ratings are not as extreme but are consistent with the picture of cognitively oriented individuals to whom information about the world and other people is most important.

Type 2: Escapist. These people are not exactly passive in their needs but they appear to seek respite from the outside world. They are lowest on information/interpretive needs and highest on relaxation, escapist and social needs. Except for their need to have things to do with others they are primarily self oriented.

Type 3: Socially conscious. These people have the highest score for social comparison needs, although they do not differ significantly from the information dependent. They also have the lowest need for consumer information and escape. They are not high on social utilitarian needs and thus are characterized as people who are concerned with society in general.

Type 4: Self concerned. These people resemble the escapists. They are high on escapist and relaxation needs and although not significantly different from others, they have the highest score on consumer information needs. More importantly, they have the lowest scores on social comparison and social use needs. They appear to be primarily focused on themselves rather than on their environment, society, friends or family.

Four meaningful types emerged from this cluster analysis. They seem to make intuitive sense and while differences are not distinct on all the need factors, enough exist to justify treating them as conceptually different types of people. The question now is whether the types also differ on other variables.

Cluster Validation

How important are needs? If needs are the basic motives that determine why and how people use the media then basic differences should arise between the information dependent, escapist, socially conscious and self-concerned types. They should differ in media use, content preferences, satisfaction with the media and other media relevant variables. If needs arise out of life experiences types should also diverge on basic demographic and social indicators as well as on measures of personality and lifestyle. An examination of the data does reveal major differences between the types.

As Table 5 shows, there are some significant differences in media

Table 5 about here

exposure habits, particularly for newspaper reading and television viewing. Information dependent and self concerned types reported more frequent use of newspapers than did the other two groups. The escapist group was slightly higher on television viewing and radio listening, but not significantly so, and the socially conscious people were quite low on television viewing. Overall, the information dependent and self concerned types were relatively heavy users of all the media. People in the escapist group used television and radio frequently but print media less often than others. The socially conscious group was consistently lower on all measures of media exposure except for movies.

Table 6 illustrates some of the differences in content preferences with

Table 6 about here

a sample of items drawn from a larger set of content measures. These results tend to place media use in a more meaningful context. Information dependent and self concerned types, for example, had relatively similar newspaper exposure. Their content preferences, however, indicate that information dependent people

were more likely to read foreign news and Sunday magazine sections while the self concerned sought feature stories and advertising. Similarly, a higher proportion of the information dependent read Newsweek while the self concerned read New York, a magazine filled with consumer features. True to type, the escapists were more likely to "read" TV Guide and watch situation comedies. Finally, the socially conscious were drawn to news oriented content but much less likely than other types to be exposed to newspaper features or situation comedies. Apparently, their low use was due to the fact that they did not use much entertainment content.

Differences in content orientation were also revealed in replies to open-ended questions. Following Berelson's (1949) procedure, respondents were asked: "What do you miss about the newspapers you used to read?" As Table 7

Table 7 about here

indicates, inability to actively monitor their environment was the most common response given by all types. The socially conscious and information dependent types were more likely to specifically mention news than were the other two groups, who mentioned features more frequently. The self concerned were somewhat more likely to miss advertising and the information dependent comment more often on missing quality writing and reporting. In contrast to Berelson's (1949) findings, very few missed the reading experience and no one at all mentioned missing the opportunity for vicarious social interaction or the respite provided by newspapers. This could be due to the fact that the media environment has become so much richer since 1948. Respondents had television, in addition to magazines, substitute strike newspapers and other media to meet such needs.

Satisfaction with the media is a more complicated matter. Every respondent rated how well each of the 35 needs were satisfied by each of the

six media. Four types of respondents rating six media on six need dimensions results in 144 means. The data set is too large to show here. Briefly, analyses of variance with types as the independent variable and satisfaction with a particular medium for a particular need yielded 18 out of a possible 36 F's significant at $p < .05$ or less, and 25 out of 36 at $p < .1$ or less. Overall, differences between the types were not as sharp as on other measures and individual t-tests reveal significantly different means primarily for television and books. It remains to be seen if satisfaction is a mediating factor in the media substitution behavior of the four types. Unfortunately, this requires a complex analysis and will have to be examined in a separate report.

Despite the lack of sharp differences in media satisfactions between groups there is evidence that groups differed in the extent to which they missed their regular newspapers. As Table 8 indicates, the escapists were significantly

Table 8 about here

less likely to miss their newspapers than other groups. The other group means, although not significantly different, are relatively consistent with other data. Basic needs are apparently related to how people felt about the loss of their newspapers.

Inspection of the demographic characteristics shown in Table 9, indicates further significant differences between types. There were more females among

Table 9 about here

the escapist and socially conscious types whereas the other two groups were more equally divided. The escapist and self concerned subgroups were primarily white while the other two types contained a substantial proportion of minority group members. In particular, nearly 28 percent of the socially conscious

subgroup were black, Hispanic, or oriental. Minority group status could well explain their need to compare themselves to other people and groups, and could account for the high rating of the need "to gain new ideas and skills" that loaded on the social comparison factor. The information dependent and socially conscious groups were nearly a year older than the escapist and self-concerned types, indicating perhaps more mature values and cognitive skills. Finally, the socially conscious were more likely to live alone - another reason for their social comparison needs. The escapists, on the other hand, were more likely to live with their families and thus have social needs that were different than other types. More than half of the self concerned reported living in dormitories or apartments with other people. Having ample opportunity to compare themselves to similar others could account for the low rating given to social comparison needs.

DISCUSSION

Four audience types emerged from this research:

1. Information dependent people were characterized by the importance of their needs for information about the environment and about other people. Relaxation was not important to them and they were not particularly motivated by escapist, consumer or social needs. These people were heavy users of all media and tended to be more exposed to news content than any other group. They were somewhat older than the escapist and self concerned types.

2. Escapists were almost the exact opposites of information dependents. Their need for information was not important. Rather, they needed to escape, relax and have something to do with others. They were heavy users of the broadcast media and immediately gratifying content such as situation comedies. They tended to be somewhat younger and live with their families. They report missing newspapers less than any other group.

3. Socially conscious people were characterized by their high need for information about other people. While they were not significantly different from the information dependents in this regard, they did rate escapist and consumer information needs lower than any other groups and were lower on other non-cognitive needs as well. They used the media relatively less often than others and indicated the least preference for immediate gratification media content. Like the information dependents they were somewhat older. This group included a higher proportion of females, minorities and people who lived alone.

4. The self concerned were the opposite of the socially conscious. They were characterized by the low need for social comparison and had a relatively low need for activities to share with others. Theywere high on media

use but, like the escapists, they were oriented toward immediate gratification. They had the highest score on consumer information needs and showed more interest in advertising than other groups. Compared to others they were more likely to live in a dormitory or in an apartment with other young people.

Is the evidence strong enough to justify the inclusion of types in further analyses? The differences in basic needs were certainly meaningful and related to consistent variations in media use and content preferences. While differences were not as sharp on satisfaction scores, the relationships could be more complex than these preliminary analyses revealed. Finally, the appearance of readily explainable differences in demographic indices strongly suggests that these types do reflect basic differences in personal and social circumstances. The answer is a qualified "yes". These types appear to reflect underlying patterns of habitual behavior that could make a difference in other questions addressed by this study of behavior during the New York newspaper strike.

The question of generalizability can not be so easily answered. As mentioned previously, the analysis techniques used here produce a "best fit" of the available data. Thus, the types are limited in their generalizability by both the sample of needs and the sample of college students who rated them. The failure of such needs as "to pass time", "to have something to do when alone" and "to be entertained" to figure in the final factor solution is probably a result of the choice of young, well-to-do, busy college students as a sample. Other researchers using different subjects and different needs would probably discover different typologies. This is a problem, however, that will continue to beleaguer uses and gratifications researchers until standardized batteries of need items are developed.

The lack of generalizable needs and typologies highlights a weak spot in the uses and gratifications paradigm. As Stephenson (1953) recommended,

typologies should be created from items that are derived from some more general theoretical system. Katz, Gurevitch and Haas (1973) followed this approach in creating their set of needs. In general, however, the use of theoretical notions to derive items is still relatively rare in the uses and gratifications approach. Clearly, any attempt to develop a fully generalizable audience typology based on needs will require better theoretical underpinning in addition to a systematic research program.

While generalizability of audience typologies is important for theoretical reasons, it should not obscure the more practical implications of the segmentation approach. The fact is that any audience can be segmented in a way that can provide valuable information to media planners and policy makers. As Mendelsohn (1974) has noted:

> By concentrating on explicitly designated target audiences, it is possible to focus on the needs, wants, uses and gratification syndromes of one specific audience at a time in a coherent and systematic fashion. Once a determination of a specific target audience is made, strategies can be developed in terms of specific media goals...Data from tests can become the empirical base for policy formation in the middle range. (p. 313)

Using a segmentation approach planners are no longer forced to aim for the lowest common denominator in a mass audience. They can target specific messages in the media preferred by each audience type. Armed with knowledge about audience typologies, they can use the media more efficiently and perhaps, with greater effect. The development of audience typologies and their elaboration could thus have enormous practical value.

FOOTNOTES

1. There are many kinds of cluster analytic techniques. Some are most appropriate for grouping things, while others are best for isolating people, typologies or syndromes. The Singleton-Kautz cluster analysis used here was designed to minimize within cluster varience. The program generates a variable number of solutions depending on the specifications set by the analyst. Each solution differs according to the number of clusters it contains. In all cases, the clusters in a particular solution will have different structures and minimum within-groups variation. This type of analysis is more flexible than Q-procedures because it does not require elaborate sorting procedures and it can be used on nominal, ordinal and interval data as long as they are standardized. This cluster analysis is also easier to interpret. In Q-factor analysis individuals often load on more than one group. This cluster technique produces a number of solutions but in each case the people are uniquely classified.

2. The average factor interitem correlations were as follows: Information/Interpretation = .360. Social Comparison = .386, Consumer Information = .338, Escape = .581, Relaxation = .327, Social Uses = .394. While these interitem correlations are not very high, the use of factor scores based on all 32 items results in scores of somewhat higher reliability.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, K.D. (1974), "Cluster Analysis." In D.R. Heise (ed.) Sociological Methodology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, F.M., E.A. Pessemier and D.T. Tigert (1969), "A Taxonomy of Magazine Readership Applied to Problems in Marketing Strategy and Media Selection." Journal of Business, 42, pp. 337-363.

Becker, L.B. (1979), "Measurement of gratifications." Communication Research 6: 54-73.

Berelson, B. (1949), "What 'missing the newspaper' means" in P. Lazarsfeld and F. Stanton (eds.) Communication Research, 1948-1949. New York: Harper, 111-129

Blumler, J.G. (1979), "The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies." Communication Research. 6: 9-36.

Brown, J.R., J.K. Crammond and R.J. Wilde (1974), "Displacement effects of television and the child's functional orientation to media." in J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communication: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Engel, J.F., H.F. Fiorillo, and M.A. Cayley (1972), Market Segmentation: Concepts and Applications. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Green, P.E. and D.S. Tull (1970) Research for marketing decisions. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gutman, J. (1978), "Television viewer types: A Q-Analysis." Journal of Broadcasting 22: 505-515.

Haley, R.I. (1971), "Beyond benefit segmentation." Journal of Advertising Research. 11: 3-8.

Haley, R.I. (1968), "Benefit segmentation: a decision-oriented research tool." Journal of Marketing. 32: 30-35.

Katz E., M. Gurevitch and H. Haas (1973), "On the use of mass media for important things." American Sociological Review, 38: 164-181.

Kline, F.G., P.V. Miller and A.J. Morrison (1974), "Adolescents and family planning information: an exploration of audience needs and media effects." in J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communication: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kimball, P.T. (1963) "New York readers in a newspaper shutdown." Columbia Journalism Review. 2: 47-56.

Levy, M.R. (1978), "The audience experience with television news." Journalism Monographs No. 55.

BIBLIOGRAPHY - Continued

Levy, M.R. (1978), "The audience for television news interview programs." Journal of Broadcasting. 22: 339-347.

Larkin, E.F. and G.L. Grotta (1979), "A market segmentation approach to daily newspaper audience studies." Journalism Quarterly, 56: 33-37, 133.

Lometti, G.E., B. Reeves and C.R. Bybee (1977), "Investigating the assumptions of uses and gratifications research." Communication Research, 4: 321-338.

McFadden, R.D. (1978) "Strike hurts papers but city gets by." The Daily Metro. September 26

McGuire, W.J. (1974) "Psychological motives and communication gratification." in J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communication: Current Perspectives on Gratification Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

McQuail, D., J.G. Blumler and J.R. Brown (1972), "The television audience: a revised perspective," in D. McQuail (ed.) Sociology of Mass Communications. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Mendelsohn, H. (1974), "Some policy implications of the uses and gratifications paradigm." in J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communication: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Palmgreen, P., L.A. Wenner and J.D. Rayburn (1979), "Relations between gratifications sought and gratifications obtained: a study of television news." Unpublished paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism Convention, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, 1979.

Peled, T. and E. Katz (1974), "Media functions in wartime: the Israeli home front in October 1973." in J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communication: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rosengren, K.E. (1974), "Uses and gratifications: a paradigm outlined." in J.G. Blumler and E. Katz (eds.) The Uses of Mass Communication: Current Perspectives on Gratifications Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sokol, R.P. (1977), "Clustering and classification: Background and current directions." In J. Van Ryzin (ed.) Classification and Clustering. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Stephenson, W. (1953) The Study of Behavior Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wright, C.R. (1959), Mass Communication: A Sociological Perspective. New York: Random House.

Table 1: Hypothesized Needs

Needs for Information about the Environment

1. To be informed about what is going on around me.
2. To know what is going on in the nation.
3. To know what is going on locally.
4. To know what is going on around the world.
5. To follow events as they happen.
6. To see what other people are thinking.

Needs for Interpretation and Guidance

1. To have thought out opinions on important subjects.
2. To have facts to back up my opinions.
3. To compare my ideas to what others are thinking.
4. To know how to act in social situations.
5. To decide who to vote for.
6. To know how to interpret events.
7. To keep track of things that might effect my life.
8. To gain new ideas and skills.

Needs for diversion

1. To relax.
2. To be entertained.
3. To take my mind off my work.
4. To take my mind off my problems.
5. To satisfy my curiosity.
6. To have a good time.
7. To pass time.
8. To keep up with hobbies and interests.
9. To have something to do when I am alone.

Table 1: Continued

Needs for social contact and integration

1. To learn what other people are like.
2. To keep up with famous people.
3. To understand some of the problems other people have.
4. To see what other cultures are like.
5. To have something to do with my family.
6. To have something to do with friends.
7. To have something to talk about.

Needs for consumer information

1. To learn about new products.
2. To learn where to shop.
3. To see how other people dress.
4. To learn about new places to go for entertainment.

Table 2: Factor Analysis of Important Needs

Needs	Factor Pattern Coefficients					
I. Information/Interpretation	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1. To know what is going on around the world...	.787	.033	-.094	.069	-.084	-.063
2. To follow events as they happen.....	.784	-.075	.100	-.029	-.041	-.039
3. To know what is going on in the nation.....	.735	.149	.071	-.070	.102	-.222
4. To be informed about what's going on around me.....	.653	.004	.098	-.154	-.025	-.050
5. To keep track of things that might effect my life.....	.461	.069	-.116	.215	-.039	.049
6. To have thought out opinions on important subjects.....	.424	.095	-.100	.055	-.181	.411
7. To have facts to back up my opinions.....	.413	.176	-.068	-.040	.096	.216
8. To know what is going on locally.....	.408	-.037	.316	-.166	-.049	.110
9. To know how to interpret events.....	.377	.237	-.081	.298	-.155	.109
II. Social Comparison	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1. To see what other people are thinking.....	.155	.683	.041	-.020	.043	-.166
2. To gain new ideas or skills.....	.029	.597	-.063	.013	-.016	.088
3. To learn what other people are like.....	-.049	.566	.113	.002	.147	.086
4. To compare my ideas to what others are thinking.....	.115	.506	.022	.038	-.305	.196
5. To understand some of the problems other people have.....	.249	.378	.149	.088	-.417	.249

Table 2: Continued

Needs	Factor Pattern Coefficients					
III. Consumer Information	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1. To learn where to shop.....	.010	.217	.523	-.062	.042	.176
2. To see how other people dress.....	-.251	.395	.516	.075	.041	-.027
3. To learn about new places to go for entertainment.....	-.043	.043	.502	.045	.092	.290
4. To keep up with famous people.....	.081	-.064	.498	.258	-.165	-.062
5. To learn about new products.....	.333	.060	.453	.006	.030	.012
IV. Escape						
1. To take my mind off my work.....	.030	-.069	-.005	.836	.074	-.078
2. To take my mind off my problems.....	-.112	.037	.124	.703	-.005	.062
3. To reduce tension.....	-.116	.035	.072	.601	.013	.159
V. Relaxation						
1. To have a good time.....	.017	.143	-.012	.208	.587	.205
2. To relax.....	-.080	.187	-.059	.277	.459	.118
VI. Social Needs						
1. To know how to act in social situations.....	-.000	.028	.127	.127	.053	.590
2. To have something to do with my family.....	-.098	.016	-.013	-.009	-.032	.567
3. To have something to do with friends.....	-.066	-.027	.106	.211	.225	.482
4. To have something to talk about.....	.105	.083	.164	.038	.207	.381

Table 2: Continued

The following items failed to obtain a single loading greater than .30:

1. To see what other cultures are like.
2. To be entertained.
3. To satisfy my curiousity.
4. To keep up with hobbies and interests.

N = 192

Table 3: Intercorrelations of Need Factors

Factors	Factors					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
I. Information/Interpretation	1.000	.311**	.112	.014	-.178*	.106
II. Social Comparison		1.000	.181*	.185*	.000	.383**
III. Consumer Information			1.000	.203**	.084	.268**
IV. Escape				1.000	.247**	.417**
V. Relaxation					1.000	.172*
VI. Social Needs						1.000

N = 192

*p∠.05

**p∠.01

Table 4: Types Clustered by Importance of Needs

Factors	Average Importance	Types 1	2	3	4	F*	Groups Differing Significantly**
I. Information/Interpretation	2.10	1.60	2.53	1.95	2.14	42.78	all differ
II. Social Comparison	2.42	2.16	2.53	2.08	2.78	12.34	1&2,1&4,2&4,2&3 3&4
III. Consumer Information	3.14	2.98	2.93	3.68	2.86	13.93	3&1,3&2,3&4
IV. Escape	2.62	2.74	2.11	2.83	2.20	10.33	3&1,3&2,3&4
V. Relaxation	2.40	2.97	2.14	2.36	2.30	24.53	1&2,1&3,1&4
VI. Social Uses	2.74	2.82	2.29	2.86	3.20	10.34	2&1,2&3,2&4
N	192	57	58	43	34		

* all F's $p < .001$

** Two tailed t-test, $p < .05$

1 = "Extremely important"; 5 = "Not important at all".

Table 5: Media Use Before Strike by Type

	Information Dependent 1	Escapist 2	Socially Conscious 3	Self Concerned 4	F	Groups Differing Significantly***
a. Newspaper reading Days/week	5.80	4.47	4.42	5.68	6.63**	1&2,1&3,4&2,4&3
b. T.V. viewing Days/week	4.79	5.05	3.40	4.97	4.97*	3&1,3&2,3&4
c. Radio listening Days/week	6.12	6.24	5.60	6.12	NS	--
d. Magazine reading Days/week	3.00	2.20	2.19	3.18	3.46*	--
e. Book reading Books/year	24.5	15.2	24.4	26.9	2.83*	--
f. Movie viewing Movies/month	2.38	2.24	2.26	2.56	NS	--
N =	57	58	43	34		

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

*** two tailed t-test, $p < .05$

Table 6: Media Content Used Regularly before Strike by Type

	Percent Reading/Listening/Viewing					
	Information Dependent 1	Escapist 2	Socially Conscious 3	Self Concerned 4	χ^2	P
Newspapers						
a. Foreign News	73.5%	36.2%	72.7%	63.3%	17.2	<.001
b. Features	53.1%	44.7%	36.4%	73.3%	9.65	<.02
c. Advertisements	18.4%	12.8%	15.2%	40.0%	9.56	<.02
d. Sunday Magazine	78.9%	53.4%	51.2%	67.6%	11.4	<.01
Magazines						
a. Newsweek	31.6%	13.8%	41.9%	20.6%	11.4	<.01
b. New York	31.6%	22.4%	27.9%	47.1%	6.32	<.1
c. TV Guide	42.1%	50.0%	23.3%	35.3%	7.85	<.05
Radio						
a. All News Radio	38.6%	17.2%	27.9%	17.6%	8.34	<.05
T.V. - Usually Watch						
a. News	66.7%	31.0%	41.9%	52.9%	17.4	<.01
b. Cultural Specials	28.1%	12.1%	25.6%	20.6%	10.7	<.1
c. Situation Comedies	28.1%	44.8%	9.3%	26.5%	31.7	<.001
N =	57	58	43	34		

Table 7: Content missed in Newspaper by Type

	Information Dependent	Escapist	Socially Conscious	Self Concerned
General Surveillance	64.9%	56.9%	58.1%	61.8%
News	26.3%	10.3%	20.9%	17.6%
Features	45.6%	51.7%	30.2%	52.9%
Quality writing and reporting	21.0%	10.4%	7.0%	17.6%
Advertising	3.5%	3.4%	7.0%	11.8%
Reading experience	5.3%	3.4%	2.3%	2.9%
N =	57	58	43	34

Responses do not add to 100% because of multiple mentions

Table 8: Missing Newspaper read before strike by Type

	$\bar{x}$
1. Information Dependant	2.13
2. Escapist	2.91
3. Socially Conscious	2.30
4. Self Concerned	2.23

$F = 6.59$, $p < .001$, $N = 192$

---

2 & 1 , 2 & 3 , 2 & 4 differ significantly

---

1 = miss extremely ; 5 = not at all

Table 9: Demographics by Type

	Information Dependant 1	Escapist 2	Socially Conscious 3	Self Concerned 4		
Sex						
Male	46.4%	34.5%	30.2%	47.1%	χ^2= 4.09	p < .2
Female	53.6	65.5	69.8	52.9		
Race						
White	83.9%	94.8%	72.1%	91.2%	χ^2=13.6	p < .05
Black	10.7	1.7	11.6	2.9		
Other	5.4	3.4	16.3	5.9		
Age						
Years	20.9	19.3	20.8	19.8	F= 3.00	p < .05
Living Arrangement						
Alone	8.8%	1.7%	16.3%	8.8%	χ^2=13.2	p < .05
Family/spouse	57.9	67.2	48.8	38.2		
Unrelated others	33.3	31.0	34.9	52.9		
N =	57	58	43	34		